Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

long as wide, with densely pubescent and white-ciliolate bracts, and *H. Maximiliani* Schrad, has dull green, pinnately veined conduplicate, elongated lanceolate leaves, about 6 cm. long, 16 mm. wide, or in that proportion, and involucral bracts in four series (this last character is hardly noticeable except on the living plant).

The species grows in dry soil on the open prairie in central North Dakota. The type was collected by myself at Leeds, on September 10, 1900.

Leeds, North Dakota.

The Name of Our American Wax Bayberries.

J. A. NIEUWLAND.

Quite a number of botanists more or less recent and others even generations ago have come to the conclusion that the Linnaean aggregate genus *Myrica* like so many other of his composite groups to which he applied the name genus, should be split up, not only for convenience but to show proper phytological relations. The European bayberries had been called *Gale* first by J. J. Bauhin in 1650, and nearly all botanists after him, Tournefort included, accepted the name without hesitation. Linnaeus, however, whatever other reasons he may have had for not liking the name, rejected it because it was not of Latin origin, and to make the confusion worse gave the bereaved plants the name *Myrica,* which for centuries by botanists, and still by common people where the plants grow, had been used for what Linnaeus called *Tamarix,* from *Tamariscus.* Such wanton transfer and changing of well-grounded and well-established names seems to have been a very favorite amusement of Linnaeus, and not a few of these nomenclatural piracies are unhesitatingly accepted by botanists now who hold that 1753 is the beginning of botanical nomenclature, if not botanical science as well.

In looking through the old English herbals of Parkinson* and Gerarde† one cannot but help seeing, even if only superficially acquainted with the *Species Plantarum* of Linnaeus, that this author obtained some good ideas from the two Englishmen, which have perhaps been unthinkingly accredited as original with the eighteenth century botanist. Though Parkinson and Gerarde can not perhaps be said to have used many more binary plant names proportionately than Dodonaeus, Camerarius, Thalius or Matthiolus, still the arrangement of such names in separate headings, is so striking to the eye, and the names so much resemble the Linnaean trivial names, that one can hardly help thinking that the Swedish botanist had very carefully studied the English herbals and considered their ideas of trivial names, (not at all original with them, however,) as worthy of being followed. Scores of such names could be brought forward perhaps to show that Linnaeus was much influenced by Parkinson and Gerarde, just as the latter were influenced by or even bodily copied from Clusius Dodonaeus, Tragus and Fuchs. This fact seems all the more striking when we find that Linnaeus copied even the mistakes of the other authors.

---

* Parkinson, J. Theatrum Botanicum, 1640.

† Gerarde, J, The Herball or Historie of Plants, 1597,

It appears that both Gerarde and Parkinson substituted *Tamariscus* for the Theophrastan names *Myrica,* whereas, the former name, if mentioned at all, was only given as a synonyme by other older botanists. Linneaus followed the Englishmen in using the synonyme for the valid name and then thought himself free to apply the displaced name *Myrica* to any group of plants he wished. I can find no other reason why Linnaeus should have caused this confusion, though it is to be questioned whether it is worth while to try to investigate the changes of names made by him, as so many appear as deliberate and wanton robberies. This may, however, explain, if explanation is worth while, why assuming the wrong name for the Tamarisk and finding the name *Myrica,* a synonyme, he felt himself free to apply it to anything he wished, therefore, why not to the bayberries. He thus made two blunders at once, the first in depriving a plant of its older and more commonly used name even in his time, and the second mistake in using that name as a substitute for another well established and unobjectionable name of yet another plant group.

One would think that assuming 1753 as the beginning of nomenclature this confusion could not have been perpetrated, but as we shall see the post-Linnaean confusion of names is worse perhaps than that caused by the Linnaean blunder, caused too by the appeal to the same principles as prompted Linnaeus.

Small, in his *Flora of the Southern States,* on the assumption that our American plants are generically different from the European plants, the type of the *Myrica* of Linnaeus and the *Gale* of Tournefort and J. Bauhin, separated them, and used the oldest synonyme of a segregate genus, that of *Morella* of Loureiro, 1790. Dr. Greene has shown that the *Morella* of Loureiro had for its type a Cochin-Chinese plant as distinct, if not more so, from our American plants generically, than the latter are from *Gale* Tour., 1703, or what is the same, the *Myrica,* Linn., 1737 and 1753.

Mr. I. Tidestrom, in his *Elysium Marianum,** also distinguished the two genera by different names. He rejects the *Gale* altogether as not being a Latin name, for the same reason that *Hondbessen* and *Gansblum* of Adanson have been universally rejected in spite of their priority. The name, he says, comes from the Belgian or low Dutch *Gagel* as J. Bauhin intimates. Mr. Tidestrom gives the European plant the name *Angeia.* Dr. Greene† maintains, however, that *Gale* is admissable, as a Latin two-syllabled word, whose origin, moreover, is said to be rather from the English Gaule or Gale, saying too, that as a latinized word it was not objected to for etymological reasons during 250 years, and even after Linnaeus' attempted suppression, the word was restored by several authors, one as late as 1902.

Mr. Tidestrom gives to the American bayberries the new name *Cerothamnus.* Dr. Greene* remarks in this connection that "as regards the new name, *Cerothamnus* for the Bayberry shrubs and trees it seems as if some statement ought to have been made of the reason for ignoring Rafinesque's name *Cerophora.*†" Dr. Greene finds, however, that Rafinesque, like Linnaeus, transposed the plants, (or rather types in this case), and this in such a way that there is a complete uncertainty about the application of Rafinesque's name. He apparently presumes to make our American plants the type of the Linnaean genus and calls it *Cerophora,* a proceeding thus far parallel with that of Salisbury's blunder in giving the type of the genus *Nymphaea* of Linnaeus a new name, *Castalia,* and leaving *Nuphar,* the yellow pond lilies, the name *Nymphaea.* The analogy is not perfect, however, for though Rafinesque apparently left the American bayberries under *Myrica* Linn., yet the confusion is more inexplicable as some of our native species seem to be left under both names. Rafinesque, too, it would seem, wished to get rid of the name *Gale* at any cost. Dr. Greene concludes: "As for the real *Cerophora* and its applicability, the first lines of Rafinesque's paragraph indicate his purpose to have been mainly that of being rid of *Gale,* which he says is Dutch, whereas, in truth it is English. But, passing from the consideration of the name *Cerophora,* as a substitute for the Linnaean *Myrica,* to what particular type does the new name apply. When the author immediately after the name cites *Gale,* Tournefort, as its equivalent, we seem compelled to regard *Myrica Gale,* Linn., as its type; but, yet, the very name *Cerophora* seems to contradict that; for the gale shrub is not wax-bearing. And the thought is contradicted again when, proceeding to the two subgenera of *Cerophora* he plainly makes our exclusively American wax-bearing shrubs the typical subgenera.

---

* Tidestrom, I. Elysium Marianum. Washington, 1910. p. 41.

† Greene, E. L. Leaflets of Botanical Observation, Vol. II, 1910, p. 102.

* l. c. p. 103.

† Rafinesque, C. S. Alsographia Americana, pp. 9-12, (1838).

There must then forever remain two opinions as to the tenebility of *Cerophora,* Raf., and I find myself at accord with the author who has proposed the new name *Cerothamnus.**" At this stage it would seem that there is a great deal of room for quibbling about the tenebility of Refinesque's name in spite of the perplexing confusion of his types and names, and botanists might hope to assume or reject it with a certain show of reason, unless they do as Dr. Greene and Mr. Tidestrom have done, i. e., consider *Cerophora* as a confused doubtful application, and so reject it altogether on that account alone; for a publication of a name must be clear and beyond shadow of doubt.

I find, however, that a fortunate circumstance comes to our assistance in unravelling the tangle, and solves the difficulty for all time as far as Rafinesque's name is concerned, so that there need not forever remain two opinions as to the tenebility of *Cerophora;* for the *Cerophora,* Raf., 1838, as a name for any group of bay-berries is a homonym of over thirty years standing. In fact, what is more remarkable about the matter, is that the first *Cerophora* of 1808 was applied by Rafinesque himself to a genus of fungi. In the *Medical Repository* of 1808* he had proposed the name for a new group of fungi, and the name had actually gotten into quotation in Steudel's Index.

It is not necessary to attempt to explain how Rafinesque, who was forever criticising his contemporaries for using homonyms or synonyms could have so far forgotten himself as to reduce names of his own making to the role of homonyms, unless he held in this case, as he was known to have done in other similar instances, that an author of a name may change it at will, or even replace it. I shall also leave it to the mycologists to determine what the first *Cerophora* may be, still it may not be amiss to give the short paragraph of Rafinesque in full, and let others judge as to the validity of *Cerophora,* Raf., 1808.

"Cerophora, (clavata, globosa, pyriformis, thamnioides, dichotoma, fastigiata, minuta, etc.) is a fine new genus akin to *hydnum,* but the fructification is in horn like terminal papillas. Found in different states." *

---

* The Medical Repository, 2nd Hexade, Vol. V, p. 355, (1808).

Steudel mentions only two species of *Cerophora, C. clavata* and *C. capitata,* and refers both to Rafinesque, though the latter is not found in that author's list. †

A review, or rather a mere translation of the above mentioned diagnosis of Rafinesque's *Cerophora* of 1808, found its way into the *Journal de Botanique, Tome II, 1809, p. 176.* As it seems but a French rendition of the original no further note of it is of interest.

In still another work of Rafinesque printed by the author at Palermo in 1814,* another reference to the fungus genus *Cerophora* is made. The characters seem somewhat more clear, and it is evidently the publication of the genus that came to the notice of Steudel just referred to. It may be of interest to give the text completely as the work of Rafinesque is very rare.

("G. *Cerophora.*

Peride sessile on stipité, simple ou ramifie, fructification superieure en forme des petites cornes ou pointes solides.

Obs. Ce g. ne diffère presque de l' *Hydnum* que par sa fructification superieure, et de l' *Hericium* que par ses pointes dures et laches.

174. *Cerophora clavata* peride en massue cylindracée entierement convert de pointes. *Dans le N. Jersey.*")

175. *Cerophora capitata.* Stipité, péride sphèrique entierement convert de pointes. *Dans le N. Jersey.*

Mr. Tidestrom's name *Cerothamnus* is then the only and oldest one for our segregated American wax bayberries, and there can not possibly be any quibbling about Rafinesque's name *Cerophora* of 1838. I shall briefly give a resumé of the synonymy of the two genera.

1. GALE, J. Bauhin, 1650,* also Tour, 1703,† Duhamel 1755,‡ and Adanson 1763.§

---

* Med. Rep., (1808) l. c.

† Steudel, E. Nomenclator Botanicus, Plant Crypt. (1822), p. 113.

* Rafinesque, C. S. Precis des Decouvertes et Travaux Somiologiques entre 1800 and 1814. Palerme, Royale Typ. Militaire 1814. Aux depens de l' autre.

* Bauhin, J., and Cherler, J. H., Historia Plantarum, pars. 2, p. 224, (1650).

† Tournefort, J. P. de, Act. Acad. t. 3, (1703).

‡ Duhamel du Monceau, Traité des Arbres et Arbustes, t. 1, p. 253, (1755).

§ Adanson, M., Familles des Plantes, 2nd part, p. 345, (1763).

(*Myrica*, Linn., 1737 and 1753.‖)
(*Cerophora* (?) Raf., 1838,** not *Cerophora*, Raf., 1808.††)
(*Angeia*, Tm., 1909.§§)

2. CEROTHAMNUS, Tm., 1909.§§
   (*Morella*, Small, 1903,¶¶ not *Morella*, Lour., 1790.‖‖)
   (*Cerophora* (?) Raf., 1838,** not *Cerophora*, Raf., 1808.††)

Department of Botany,
The University of Notre Dame, Ind.

Pteridium, J. Agardh, A Homonym.

J. A. NIEUWLAND.

J. Agardh* in segregating *Delesseria alata* as the type of a new genus, *Pteridium* from the other delesserias, seems to have forgotten that the name *Pteridium* had been used by Scopoli in 1760†, for the new genus founded on the Linnaean *Pteris aquilina*, or common bracken. The genus of Scopoli called *Thelypteris* before Linnaeus has lately become again recognized as a valid one, and it certainly seems to be entitled to distinct generic standing from *Pteris*. Even Theophrastus accepted it as such and the name, *Thelypteris*, for the common bracken originated with him, a name which on the basis of absolute priority is the correct one. The custom of not accepting names prior to 1753, however, has caused much confusion, and this is but a minor instance of the kind. Until 1753 be obragated as a

---

‖ Linnaeus, C., Genera Plantarum, no. 746, p. 302, (1737).
Linnaeus, C., Species Plantarum, p. 1024, (1753).

** Rafinesque, C. S., Alsographia Americana, pp. 9-12, (1838).

†† Rafinesque, C. S., Medical Repository, p. 335, (1808).

§§ Tidestrom, I., Elysium Marianum, 1910, p. 37.

‖‖ Loureiro, J. de, Flora Cochin-Chinensis, p. 548, (1790).

¶¶ Small, J. K., Flora of the Southeastern United States, p. 337, (1903).

* Agardh, J. G. Spec. Gen. Ord. Alg. Vol. 3, Pars. 3, p. 218. Genus 3, Lundae (1898).

† Scopoli, J. A. Flora Carniolica, 1760, p. 169.